

REMARKS

This response is a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed March 14, 2007. In the present Office Action, the Examiner has noted that claims 1-16, 18-37, and 123-154 are pending, that claims 145-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, that claims 145-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, that claims 1-12, 13-16, 18-37, 123-132, 134-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Reconsideration of the present application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16, 18-37, 123, 126-130, 132-135, 138-140, 142-145, 148-150, and 152-155 are pending. Claims 1, 13-14, 19-20, 22-23, 28-35, 123, 126, 129, 132-135, 142-145, 148-150, and 152-154 have been amended. Claims 124-125, 131, 136-137, 141, 146-147, and 151 have been cancelled. New claim 155 has been added. Support for new claim 155 may be found at least at original claim 17. No new matter has been added.

RELIED-UPON DOCUMENTS

U.S. Patent 5,138,460 to Egawa (hereinafter referenced as "Egawa") and U.S. Patent 6,256,058 to Kang et al.(hereinafter referenced as "Kang"), U.S. Patent 6,304,284 to Dunton et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Dunton"), U.S. Patent 6,269,144 to Dube et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Dube"), U.S. Patent 6,657,667 to Anderson (hereinafter referenced as "Anderson"), U.S. Patent 6,268,936 to Truc et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Truc"), U.S. Patent 6,144,804 to Inoue (hereinafter referenced as

"Inoue"), U.S. Patent Application 2002/0175924 A1 to Yui et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Yui"), are all cited and relied upon in the present Office Action.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 145-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without taking positions with regard to these rejections other than those previously discussed in one or more previous responses, Assignee has amended claims 145-154 to more closely follow the Examiner's suggested amendments in order to move prosecution forward. Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 145-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without taking positions with regard to these rejections other than those previously discussed in one or more previous responses, Assignee has amended claims 145-154 to more closely follow the Examiner's suggested amendments in order to move prosecution forward. Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

CLAIMS REJECTION 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12, 13-16, 18-37, 123-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Egawa, Kang, Dunton, Dube, Inoue, Anderson, Truc, and Yui. Assignee respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Assignee has amended the claims to further clarify the claimed techniques to expedite examination of the application.

It is noted that as required by 35 USC 103(a), in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all the claim limitations of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested by the prior documents. It is respectfully submitted that the cited documents do not meet these criteria. For example, the applied documents, either alone or in combination, still do not teach or suggest all the claim elements.

Egawa discloses an apparatus for forming composite images. However, Egawa does not disclose “perspective conversion circuitry configured to perform a perspective correction operation” as recited in amended claim 1. There is no disclosure in Egawa of perspective conversion operations.

In section 14 of the Office Action, at pages 16-17, the Examiner relies on Truc for disclosure regarding perspective conversion circuitry. The Examiner states “Truc et al discloses a film scanner as shown in Figure 8 and teaches the conventional modification of colors associated with panoramic and photographic images (see column 5, lines 25-36, column 7, lines 26-40).” However, Assignee respectfully submits that nowhere in the passages cited by the Examiner, nor at any other passage or Figure of Truc, is perspective conversion disclosed. For example, there is no teaching of

“perspective conversion circuitry configured to perform a perspective correction operation” as recited in amended claim 1. Rather, Truc discloses the detection of image boundaries, as well as a touch screen providing a menu of various image manipulation operations, none of which include perspective conversion.

Dunton, Dube, Inoue, Yui, and Anderson also do not disclose “perspective conversion circuitry configured to perform a perspective correction operation” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, any combination of Egawa, Kang, Dunton, Dube, Inoue, Anderson, Truc, and/or Yui would not yield “perspective conversion circuitry configured to perform a perspective correction operation” as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-16, 18-37, and 155 depending therefrom, distinguish over any purported combination of Egawa, Kang, Dunton, Dube, Inoue, Anderson, Truc, and/or Yui, whether or not such combination is properly made. Assignee therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Amended claims 123, 135, and 145 recite elements similar to those discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above in connection with amended claim 1, Assignee respectfully submits that claims 123, 135, and 145, as well as claims 123, 126-130, 132-134, 138-140, 142-144, 148-150, and 152-154 depending therefrom, distinguish over any purported combination of Egawa, Kang, Dunton, Dube, Inoue, Anderson, Truc, and/or Yui, whether such combination is properly made or otherwise. Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

It is noted that claimed subject matter may be patentably distinguished from the applied documents for additional reasons; however, the foregoing is believed to be sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections discussed above.

Further, it is noted that the Assignee's failure to comment directly upon any of the positions asserted by the Examiner in the office action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with those asserted positions since the Examiner's other positions are believed to be moot in light of the foregoing.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in the present patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the present patent application in view of the same and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested. Please charge any underpayments or credit any overpayments to deposit account no. No. 50-3703.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/14/07

By /Calvin E. Wells Reg. No. 43,256/

Calvin E. Wells
Registration No. 43,256

Customer No. 43831
Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLP
17933 NW Evergreen Parkway, Suite 250
Beaverton, OR 97006
Phone: 503.439.6500

cc: Docketing